

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed April 20, 2007, has been received and carefully reviewed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. No claims have been cancelled, amended or added.

Claim 136 was rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16-31 of U.S. Patent No. 6,288,012.

Claims 136, 147-149 and 158-159 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,495,494.

Claims 127-149, 156, 158 and 159 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 62-100 of U.S. Patent No. 6,673,753.

Claims 127-159 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-45 of U.S. Patent No. 6,207,622.

Applicants submit herewith a terminal disclaimer to obviate these double patenting rejections.

Claims 136, 147-149 and 156-159 were provisionally rejected on the ground of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 44-48, 50-54 and 62-73 of copending Application Nos. 10/715,575 and 10/715,692.

Applicants submit herewith a terminal disclaimer to obviate these double patenting rejections.


As the Examiner has made no other rejection of claims 127-159, it is believed that the submitted terminal disclaimers put these claims in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: Oct 19, 2007

  
Katherine M. Kowalchyk  
Reg. No. 36,848  
KMK:EED:PLSkaw